IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.2438 OF 2006

Shri Palaniappan Manivelam ... Petitioner

Vs.

Addl. Dy. Commissioner of Police, Anti Corruption Bureau & Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. P.B. Shah for the petitioner.

Ms. M.H. Mhatre, A.P.P. for the State.

Mr. D.N. Bhong, A.C.P., Anti Corruption Bureau, is present.

**CORAM : SMT. RANJANA DESAI, J.**

**DATED : 14TH DECEMBER, 2006.**

**P.C. :-**

1. The case of the petitioner is that he has purchased a Motor Vehicle bearing No.KA-03/MA-1200 (for convenience, “the said vehicle”) in Bangalore. He applied to the Bangalore Transport Authorities that the said vehicle may be transferred to his name and he may be permitted to bring the said vehicle to Bombay. The petitioner was informed that this request cannot be granted because the Joint Commissioner for

Transport, Bangalore, has informed the Regional Transport Officer, Bangalore Central, by a letter dated 10/2/2006 that the said vehicle should not be transferred to the petitioner's name till the consent is obtained from the Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police, ACB, BMU, Mumbai. It appears that by letter dated 30/1/2006, the Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police, ACB, Mumbai Police, directed the Joint Commissioner of Transport, (ENF) Bangalore, not to transfer the vehicle. The petitioner has, therefore, filed this petition praying that the said letter be quashed and the respondents be directed to transfer the said vehicle in the name of the petitioner and he may be permitted to bring the said vehicle to Bombay.

2. I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P. appearing for the State.

3. The learned A.P.P. on instructions from Mr. D.N. Bhong, A.C.P., Anti Corruption Bureau, who is present in the court, states that the Additional Commissioner of Police, ACB, Bombay has no objection if the said vehicle is transferred to the name of the petitioner and the petitioner is allowed to bring the said vehicle to Bombay from Bangalore. She states that the impugned direction issued by respondent 1 vide letter dated 30/1/2006 stands withdrawn and may be treated as

withdrawn. This statement is recorded and accepted by this court. Order accordingly. In view of this, nothing survives in this petition. The petition is disposed of.

[SMT. RANJANA DESAI, J.]